

## REMARKS

Applicant proposes that claim 22 should be amended as indicated above to incorporate the feature of claim 38 and that the dependencies of claims 39-41 should be adjusted accordingly. The other amendments set forth above ensure that the amendment of claim 22 does not raise a new issue by affecting the scope of a dependent claim.

The amendments set forth above also remove the rejection of claim 28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 USC 102 over Bruhin. Applicant therefore believes that the only issue to be addressed is whether the subject matter of claim 22, as now amended, is disclosed by Bruhin.

Claim 22 specifies a first engagement member mounted to the elongate body and engageable on an item to be cleaned towards a first side of the item, a second engagement member engageable on the item towards an opposite side thereof, the second engagement member being adjustably mounted on the elongate body so as to be provided at a required spacing from the first engagement member for a particular width of item to be cleaned, and a carriage member movable in a reciprocal manner along the body. Claim 22 further recites that the carriage member is movable along a required proportion of the body between the first and second engagement members and that the proportion of the elongate body along which the carriage moves is adjustable.

The examiner evidently considers the brackets 15 of Bruhin, provided with suction cups 16, to be apt counterparts for the engagement members of claim 22.

The previous claim 38 (and claim 22 as now amended) recited that the proportion of the elongate body along which the carriage moves is adjustable. This feature is supported by the description at page 2, lines 25-26, page 5, lines 19-20 and lines 30-32, and page 6, line 31 to page 7, line 1, at least. In order to meet this limitation of the

amended claim 22, Bruhin must show that the proportion of the longitudinal section 14 along which the carriage 20 moves is adjustable.

The examiner has not referred expressly to the feature of the previous claim 38 in explaining the rejection of that claim, and it appears that the only statements in the Detailed Action that may be interpreted as being in support of the rejection are that "Inherently, the width of the placement/extension of brackets 15 determines the length at which the carriage body may travel" (page 4, lines 3-4) and "Moreover the device of Bruhin can be manually adjustable by the adjustment/placement of suction cups 16 and brackets 15 (manually adjustable)" (page 4, lines 6-7). These statements show only that adjustment of the brackets 15 can be used to accommodate slight variation in the spacing of the side walls 17 between which the escalator runs. They do not affect the proportion of the longitudinal section along which the carriage 20 moves. Applicant submits that Bruhin does not disclose or suggest that there is any possibility for adjusting the proportion of the longitudinal section 14 along which the carriage 20 moves. Since the longitudinal section 14 is placed between the side walls 17, and the escalator is between the side walls, applicant submits that there would be no advantage to being able to adjust the proportion of the longitudinal section 14 along which the carriage 20 moves.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the subject matter defined in claim 22, as now amended, is not disclosed by Bruhin. Therefore, the rejection of claim 22 over Bruhin must be withdrawn. Allowance of this application is requested.

With regard to point 13 on page 8 of the Detailed Action, applicant wishes to clarify that the search report citing the documents listed in the information disclosure statement filed November 16, 2006 was the international search report, not the European search report, and that the transmittal letter with which the information disclosure statement was filed states that a copy of the international search report had been filed with the items for entering the U.S. national stage in order to qualify for the reduced national stage fee provided in 37 CFR 1.492(b)(3). Applicant did not provide

copies of the foreign documents when entering the U.S. national stage because copies were not readily available to applicant's representative at that time. It is again requested that the examiner should provide a copy of the information disclosure statement, initialed and dated to confirm that the documents have been considered, as provided in MPEP 609.05(b).

Respectfully submitted,

/John Smith-Hill/

John Smith-Hill  
Reg. No. 27,730

Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, LLP  
601 SW Second Ave. Ste. 1600  
Portland, OR 97204

Tel. (503) 278-3334  
Fax (503) 228-4373

Docket: SWIN.3523